

University of Dayton  
**eCommons**

---

[ECAS Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate](#)

---

9-29-2011

## 2011-09-29 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas\\_mins](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Senate. Executive Committee, "2011-09-29 Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate" (2011). *ECAS Minutes*. 238.  
[https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas\\_mins/238](https://ecommons.udayton.edu/ecas_mins/238)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in ECAS Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

Approved  
Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate  
September 29, 2011; 1:30pm  
St. Mary's Hall Room 113B

**Present:** Paul Benson, Corinne Daprano, George Doyle, Jesse Grewal, Jonathan Hess, Emily Hicks, Leno Pedrotti, Antonio Mari, Carolyn Phelps, Andrea Seielstad

**Absent:** Joseph Saliba, Rebecca Wells

**Guests:** Brad Duncan, Patrick Donnelly, James Farrelly

**Opening Meditation:** Jonathan Hess opened the meeting with a meditation

**Minutes:** The minutes of the September 22, 2011 ECAS meeting were approved

**Announcements:** The next meeting of ECAS is October 6, 2011 from 1:30-2:30 p.m. in SM 113B.

Announcements and documents for ECAS meetings will now be posted on Porches.

Kaitlin Regan has been elected student senator to represent the Natural Sciences and Megan Abate has been elected student senator to represent the School of Education & Allied Professions (SOEAP).

J. Hess emailed a call for volunteers to all ranked faculty for the Senate Composition Committee.

J. Hess announced that the CAP Competencies Committee needs 2 student representatives. J. Grewal will check the status of the 2 students appointed to the committee by SGA and report back to ECAS.

**New business:**

Graduate School documents. B. Duncan reviewed the *Graduate academic standards and progress policy* proposal and initiated a discussion of the document. Several members of ECAS asked for clarification and/or suggested changes to the wording of the document. B. Duncan recorded these suggested changes.

J. Farrelly then asked if the proposed policy had been approved by graduate faculty or if it was only approved by the Graduate Leadership Council (GLC). He suggested that the proposed policy should be reviewed by each unit's Graduate Academic Affairs Committee. The Office of GPCE and GLC should then provide evidence in the proposal that graduate faculty had been consulted. Further, he suggested that this proposal and the *Graduate re-take policy* proposal should be reviewed by ECAS and the Senate under legislative authority and not concurrence as currently indicated in both proposals. J. Hess agreed to follow-up with B. Duncan to discuss these issues.

**Old business:**

Faculty workload committee charge. J. Hess sent Linda Hartley, chair of FAC, the charge for the FAC's work on faculty workload that ECAS developed (see attached). The ad hoc committee is comprised of the following people: Caroline Merithew (CAS/FAC), Paul Vanderburgh (GPCE/FAC), Rebecca Wells (SBA/FAC), Stephen Richards (SOEAP/Faculty Board), and Patrick Donnelly (Office of the Provost).

E. Hicks suggested that the sentence in the charge that reads “be sure to consult with the Law School and Libraries” be clarified to indicate that “the Law School and University Libraries should be consulted and possible differences in work responsibilities be considered.”

Agenda for Oct. 14 Senate meeting. J. Hess reviewed possible agenda items for the Oct. 14 Senate meeting. These items include: 1) *student evaluation of faculty teaching* -- position statement from FAC; 2) *academic misconduct policy* -- from APC/SAPC; and, 3) *program development protocol (PDP)* -- from APC. The Graduate School documents (graduate retake policy and standards for academic good standing proposals) will not appear on the Oct. 14 agenda as anticipated.

G. Doyle indicated that the new Academic Misconduct form was designed to be consistent with the honor code. He also suggested that since this is a new form and not a new policy only ECAS approval is required. J. Hess will send the form and UD undergraduate honor code to ECAS members for review prior to next week’s meeting. At that meeting ECAS will need to determine if ECAS alone can approve the form or if approval by ECAS and the ASenate is required.

Statement on consulting. J. Hess reviewed ECAS’s decision at the Sept. 15 meeting, to a 2-step approach to the issue of consultation. This 2-step approach includes: 1) coming to a common understanding of what the Senate Constitution requires right now regarding the creation of new vice presidential positions; and, 2) formulating a plan for consultation that will be effective, meaningful, and administratively functional. J. Hess will email a request for ECAS members’ schedules in order to determine an appropriate time for a special meeting next week. The purpose of this special meeting will be to clarify the concerns of ECAS members, and formulate a specific list of concerns and/or questions that can be forward to Dan Curran and Joe Saliba prior to a meeting to discuss the issue of consultation.

Standing committee work assignments. Below is an updated list of assigned standing committee tasks:

<b>Task</b>	<b>N/C</b>	<b>Prev</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Work due</b>	<b>Due</b>
*UNRC policy doc	C	UNRC	ECAS	Review final document	??
*Consultation issue	C	ECAS	ECAS	Work to resolve issues	??
Academic misconduct	C	ECAS	APC	Final report	Sept. 27
Academic misconduct	C	APC	SAPC	Review	??
PDP proposal	C	APC	APC	Review Appendix A	Oct. 25
*Faculty evaluation	C	FAC	FAC	Rec. on purpose of eval	Oct. 11
Intellectual property rights	C	FAC	FAC	Proposal	Nov. 8
Titles for part-time faculty	C	FAC	FAC	Proposal	Nov. 8
Policy on emeritus status	N		FAC	Proposal	Nov. 8
<b>Tasks not yet assigned</b>	<b>N/C</b>	<b>Prev</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Work due</b>	<b>Due</b>
*Voting representation	N		Ad hoc	Report and proposal	??
Committee membership	C	UNRC	UNRC	Complete the list	??
Faculty workload	N		FAC	Report and proposal	Mar. 2
<b>Tasks ongoing</b>	<b>N/C</b>	<b>Prev</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Work due</b>	
Oversight of CAP dev	N		APC	Hear monthly reports	
<b>Tasks completed</b>	<b>N/C</b>	<b>Prev</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Work due</b>	<b>Due</b>
CAP&CC voting rights	N		APC	Offer recommendation	Aug. 30

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Corinne Daprano

DOC I \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Title: Implementation of University Faculty Workload Guidelines

Submitted by: Faculty Board

Date:

Action: Legislative

Reference: Senate Document 95-01 <http://www.udayton.edu/provost/#7>  
or <http://academic.udayton.edu/senate/%20documents/Documents.htm>

Rationale:

Background and contextual information:

When the Academic Senate passed its University of Dayton Faculty Workload Guidelines document (95-01) in 1995, the Provost and President of the Academic Senate at the time, Father Heft, accepted the "workload document as an administrative guideline to inform the decisions of Deans and Department Chairperson who have been asked to develop specific workload policies for their respective units that are consonant with the general spirit of this workload document." He also indicated that "this policy will be reviewed in three years."

There is no evidence to indicate that the review ever took place, but Deans and Department Chairpersons did discuss and frame workload guidelines following the passage of Senate document 95-01, and records indicate that Associate Provosts John Geiger (who eventually became Provost in 1997) and Pat Palermo approved the guidelines proposed by the units and departments of the University.

When Fred Pestello replaced John Geiger as Provost in 2001, he asked the newly hired Associate Provost for Academic and Administrative Affairs, Joe Untener, to head a Provost Council Committee on the topic of Faculty Workload. Initially, Joe reports, "one of my main objectives was to simply shine a light on it. I was amazed at how opaque all of that really was. Deans knew almost nothing of the chair's decisions or lack thereof. The provost's office, of course, knew even less. Interestingly, when I started making the teaching assignments more public, things started happening. When I included class size and then even class times, more things became apparent."

Other obligations for Associate Provost Untener in the area of University reaccreditation prohibited the formation of a working Provost Council committee on workload, so the topic was put on hold and the analysis and review of Senate document 95-01 has yet to take place. It is now seventeen years since the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate (FACAS) began work on Senate document 95-01, and FACAS should take the initiative to analyze and review the Faculty Workload Guidelines. Recent criticism both inside and outside the

Academy about faculty workload continues to raise questions about what faculty do, how much they actually teach, and the consistency of teaching assignments in various disciplines throughout a university. The "Four Principles" outlined in Senate document 95-01 certainly deserve a second look at this time, and the opaqueness cited by Joe Untener warrants the transparency of a fresh and open review.

The FACAS is asked to:

1. Review the existing policy as articulated in Senate DOC 95-01.
2. Conduct background research on the issue.
3. Examine relevant guidelines at other peer institutions and the AAUP faculty workload guidelines.
4. Formulate a list of recommendations regarding DOC 95-01.

The central focus will be teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities for full-time ranked faculty. Be sure to consult with the Law School and Libraries. The final recommendation should be presented as a Senate document from the FAC that has been vetted through FAC discussion and open hearings for the faculty at large. The ad hoc committee which does the background work should consult with all units as needed.

The Senate needs to act on this by April. Thus, ECAS suggests the following time-line:

Jan 16	Ad hoc committee completes its work and reports to the full FACAS
Feb 6	FACAS produces a draft of its document and begins discussion
Feb 27	FACAS holds open forums for members of campus community
Mar 16	FACAS submits its final document to ECAS